

Filed Electronically		
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT</b></p> <p>Address to: Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450</p>	Docket No.	UCLA-007
	Confirmation No.	8124
	Application No.	10/531,411
	Filing Date	November 4, 2005
	Examiner	Sarvamangala JN Devi
	Group Art Unit	1645
	Title	<i>Monoclonal Antibodies Specific For Cariogenic Bacteria</i>

Sir:

This communication is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed September 11, 2006. The Office Action set forth a one-month time period for response, making a response due on or before October 11, 2006. Accordingly, this response is timely filed.

#### I. REMARKS

The Office Action set out a Restriction Requirement and an Election of Species Requirement.

##### Restriction Requirement

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner required election of one of the following groups of claims:

Group I: Claims 1-12, 18-20 and 23-29;

Group II: Claims 13-17;

Group III: Claims 21-22; and

Group IV: Claim 30.

Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the claims of Group I, claims 1-12, 18-20 and 23-29, with traverse. As stated in the MPEP §803, if search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine the entire application on the merits, even though the entire application includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. It is Applicants' position that it would not be unduly burdensome to perform a search on all of the claims together in the present application. Accordingly, Applicants traverse the restriction requirement.